# EXHIBIT 3 [REDACTED]

## Case 1:23-mc-00070-LAK-GWG Document 66-3 Filed 08/23/23 Page 2 of 35 CONFIDENTIAL

1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND
3	
4	)
5	IN RE UNDER ARMOUR SECURITIES )Civil No.
6	LITIGATION ) RDB-17-388
7	)
8	
9	CONFIDENTIAL
10	
11	Videotaped Deposition of KEVIN A. PLANK,
12	held at 100 International Drive, Baltimore,
13	Maryland, commencing at 10:03 a.m.,
14	Wednesday, February 15, 2023, before
15	Tina M. Alfaro, a Notary Public within
16	and for the State of Maryland.
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	JOB No. 5630283
22	PAGES 1 - 349
	Page 1

# Case 1:23-mc-00070-LAK-GWG Document 66-3 Filed 08/23/23 Page 3 of 35 CONFIDENTIAL

1	percent profit when you sold that hundred million	16:11:19
2	in stock, right?	16:11:21
3	A. Virtually.	16:11:22
4	MR. HENSSLER: Let's go off the record.	16:11:27
5	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Off the record,	16:11:29
6	16:11.	16:11:30
7	(A break was had.)	16:23:39
8	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're back on the	16:29:49
9	record 16:29.	16:29:50
10	BY MR. HENSSLER:	16:29:53
11	Q. Welcome back, sir. You understand you're	16:29:53
12	still under oath?	16:29:56
13	A. Yes.	16:29:58
14	Q. Okay. Let's talk about what's referred to	16:29:59
15	as a quiet period.	16:30:00
16	A. Do we need this on? Okay.	16:30:02
17	Q. Let's talk about what's referred to as a	16:30:04
18	quiet period. You're familiar with that phrase	16:30:06
19	from your time as the CEO of Under Armour, right?	16:30:08
20	A. Yes.	16:30:11
21	Q. And the quiet period refers to the time	16:30:11
22	between the end of a financial quarter and the	16:30:14
		Page 259

#### Case 1:23-mc-00070-LAK-GWG Document 66-3 Filed 08/23/23 Page 4 of 35 CONFIDENTIAL

		<del></del>
1	company announcing financial results, right?	16:30:17
2	A. Yes.	16:30:22
3	Q. And is it your understanding that during	16:30:22
4	the quiet period a public company like Under Armour	16:30:25
5	must avoid selective disclosure of material	16:30:27
6	information?	16:30:30
7	MR. REISNER: Objection to form, calls for	16:30:31
8	a legal conclusion. You may answer.	16:30:33
9	A. Ask that again.	16:30:35
10	Q. Happy to.	16:30:37
11	Is it your understanding that during a	16:30:39
12	quiet period a public company like Under Armour	16:30:40
13	must avoid selective disclosure of material	16:30:43
14	information?	16:30:46
15	MR. REISNER: Same objection.	16:30:48
16	A. Yeah. Yes.	16:30:49
17	Q. And the quiet period is something that you	16:30:57
18	were well aware of during the 2015 to 2017 time	16:30:59
19	period as a CEO, right?	16:31:04
20	A. It's been consistent since we went public	16:31:05
21	in November of 2005, yes.	16:31:08
22	Q. And you understood that as a public	16:31:10
		Page 260

#### Case 1:23-mc-00070-LAK-GWG Document 66-3 Filed 08/23/23 Page 5 of 35 CONFIDENTIAL

1	was actually reacting to I can't believe he	16:43:13
2	recorded me. So it happened, forgotten about it,	16:43:15
3	never thought about it, and certainly have never	16:43:22
4	done it's not something that I do.	16:43:25
5	Q. You recorded that conversation, right?	16:43:30
6	A. I believe so, yes.	16:43:32
7	Q. Did you use your iPhone?	16:43:33
8	A. It might have happened where it happened	16:43:35
9	to be recording and I think it might have been a	16:43:37
10	surprise because, again, I have no interest in	16:43:39
11	proactively recording anyone.	16:43:42
12	Q. You sent it to someone, right?	16:43:45
13	A. I did.	16:43:47
14	Q. Did you accidentally send it to somebody?	16:43:50
15	A. No. I proactively sent it to them once I	16:43:53
16	realized that I had the recording and it was sort	16:43:56
17	of an exasperated this is my long night.	16:43:59
18	Q. You didn't tell Mr. Mirchin you were	16:44:03
19	recording him at the time you were recording that	16:44:05
20	conversation, right?	16:44:07
21	A. I don't believe I was aware that I was	16:44:08
22	recording that conversation.	16:44:09

# Case 1:23-mc-00070-LAK-GWG Document 66-3 Filed 08/23/23 Page 6 of 35 CONFIDENTIAL

1	Q. You didn't get his permission to record	16:44:10
2	him, right?	16:44:12
3	A. No, I did not.	16:44:13
4	MR. REISNER: Objection, asked and	16:44:14
5	answered.	16:44:14
6	Q. You understand that's the law in Maryland,	16:44:14
7	you have to get someone's permission to record a	16:44:16
8	conversation like that?	16:44:18
9	A. Yeah, but as I said, I don't believe I	16:44:20
10	proactively recorded that conversation with an	16:44:22
11	intent.	16:44:25
12	Q. Why did you secretly record that	16:44:28
13	conversation with Mr. Mirchin?	16:44:30
14	MR. REISNER: Objection, misstates the	16:44:32
15	evidence.	16:44:33
16	A. I feel like I've said this a few times.	16:44:33
17	We could be in disagreement if you'd like, but I	16:44:36
18	didn't secretly record that conversation with	16:44:38
19	Mr. Mirchin. I might have had my phone on, I might	16:44:41
20	have put it down because we were sitting on my back	16:44:44
21	deck and we were, as I said, drinking whiskey. I	16:44:46
22	might have rested my glass on it, I might have put	16:44:49
		Page 275

#### Case 1:23-mc-00070-LAK-GWG Document 66-3 Filed 08/23/23 Page 7 of 35 CONFIDENTIAL

1	an ashtray on it because you can hear there's a	16:44:51
2	click with a lighter going off as well. I don't	16:44:53
3	know what happened or how it got recorded. As I	16:44:56
4	said, I don't have a practice of doing that. You	16:44:58
5	all have thousands of hours of every inch of audio	16:45:00
6	that we've ever had as a company and there's not a	16:45:02
7	stitch of that happening anywhere else. So I was	16:45:05
8	as surprised as you were as I stated earlier. So	16:45:08
9	no, secretly recording was not an intention of	16:45:13
10	mine.	16:45:14
11	Q. It was your intention to send that	16:45:15
12	recording to someone else outside the company,	16:45:17
13	though, right?	16:45:19
14	MR. REISNER: Objection, asked and	16:45:20
15	answered.	16:45:20
16	A. Yeah. I was characterizing it's 8:45 or	16:45:20
17	8:30 at night, I've had a long night, I'm trying to	16:45:24
18	go home, and Matt's holding me here hostage talking	16:45:27
19	about the business.	16:45:30
20	Q. The audio that we just listened to where	16:45:36
21	you said that the Under Armour CFO, Mr. Molloy,	16:45:38
22	told you that Under Armour should take the quarter	16:45:41

#### Case 1:23-mc-00070-LAK-GWG Document 66-3 Filed 08/23/23 Page 8 of 35 CONFIDENTIAL

1	down by \$10 million, you'd agree that that was	16:45:44
2	nonpublic information, right?	16:45:47
3	MR. WAREHAM: Object to the form,	16:45:49
4	foundation, calls for a legal conclusion.	16:45:51
5	A. Can you please ask that question again.	16:45:53
6	Q. Sure.	16:45:56
7	Nobody outside of the company knew that	16:45:56
8	the CFO came to you and said we've got to take the	16:45:59
9	quarter down 10 million, right?	16:46:02
10	MR. REISNER: Objection to form. You may	16:46:06
11	answer.	16:46:07
12	A. I don't I wouldn't believe so, but I	16:46:08
13	think that a number like \$10 million would be	16:46:09
14	immaterial regardless.	16:46:12
15	Q. Well, I asked whether it was nonpublic	16:46:13
16	information.	16:46:14
17	A. I wouldn't I wouldn't have an opinion,	16:46:17
18	I don't think so, but I think \$10 million is sort	16:46:20
19	of variable one way or the other.	16:46:22
20	Q. What do you mean by "immaterial"?	16:46:24
21	A. \$10 million to a billion three or a	16:46:28
22	billion four quarter is what I would refer to as	16:46:31
	Pag	e 277

# Case 1:23-mc-00070-LAK-GWG Document 66-3 Filed 08/23/23 Page 9 of 35 CONFIDENTIAL

1	not a material amount of money.	16:46:33
2	Q. You do agree, though, that that	16:46:36
3	information that Molloy came to you, as you said on	16:46:39
4	the recording, and said we've got to drop the	16:46:42
5	quarter by 10 million, that was nonpublic	16:46:45
6	information at the time, right?	16:46:47
7	MR. REISNER: Objection to form, asked and	16:46:49
8	answered, three times already.	16:46:49
9	MR. HENSSLER: You can answer.	16:46:51
10	A. Yeah, it would feel like the kind of	16:46:52
11	information I'd be comfortable sharing with the	16:46:53
12	confidants that I had in my circle with an	16:46:55
13	understanding it would be kept in trust.	16:46:57
14	Q. There's never been any disclosure to this	16:46:59
15	day, right, that the CFO of the company came to you	16:47:01
16	in the first quarter of 2016 and said we need to	16:47:04
17	drop the quarter by 10 million, right?	16:47:08
18	MR. WAREHAM: Objection to form,	16:47:10
19	foundation, grossly mischaracterizes what	16:47:11
20	Mr. Molloy says on the record actually happened.	16:47:13
21	MR. HENSSLER: We're talking about the	16:47:15
22	audio we just listened to.	16:47:16

#### Case 1:23-mc-00070-LAK-GWG Document 66-3 Filed 08/23/23 Page 10 of 35 CONFIDENTIAL

1		
1	MR. WAREHAM: I'm talking about the record	16:47:22
2	and I'm objecting to the form of your question.	16:47:22
3	MR. HENSSLER: Do you want to play it	16:47:22
4	again?	16:47:22
5	MR. WAREHAM: Do you want to fight with me	16:47:22
6	or do you want to ask questions?	16:47:23
7	MR. HENSSLER: Well, you're misstating the	16:47:25
8	record.	16:47:26
9	MR. WAREHAM: If you want to fix the	16:47:26
10	infirmed question, fix the infirmed question. If	16:47:27
11	you want to pick door number three and fight with	16:47:30
12	me, go ahead and do that. It's late in the day.	16:47:30
13	I'm happy to have it happen.	16:47:33
14	MR. HENSSLER: I definitely don't want to	16:47:35
15	fight with anyone.	16:47:36
16	BY MR. HENSSLER:	16:47:45
17	Q. You'd agree, sir, that there's never to	16:47:45
18	this day been any public disclosure of what you	16:47:48
19	said on that audio that we just listened to, which	16:47:51
20	is Exhibit 28 to today's deposition, where you said	16:47:53
21	Molloy, the motherfucker, came to you and said	16:47:58
22	we've got to drop the quarter 10 million, right?	16:48:00
		Page 279

#### Case 1:23-mc-00070-LAK-GWG Document 66-3 Filed 08/23/23 Page 11 of 35 CONFIDENTIAL

1	MR. WAREHAM: Form and foundation	16:48:03
2	objections.	16:48:03
3	MR. REISNER: Objection to form and asked	16:48:03
4	and answered four times now.	16:48:04
5	MR. HENSSLER: You can answer.	16:48:07
6	A. Yeah. I wouldn't know why that would need	16:48:08
7	to be disclosed to anyone, to be honest with you.	16:48:10
8	So no, I'm not aware of any public disclosure	16:48:12
9	that's occurred about that \$10 million on the	16:48:15
10	1.3-billion-dollar quarter.	16:48:19
11	Q. And you sent that audio that we just	16:48:27
12	listened to to Stephanie Ruhle, right?	16:48:30
13	A. I did. And to Jen Smith.	16:48:34
14	Q. And to Jen Smith also?	16:48:35
15	A. Yes.	16:48:38
16	Q. Anyone else?	16:48:38
17	A. I don't believe. So.	16:48:39
18	Q. So you shared nonpublic information about	16:48:41
19	Under Armour's business with Stephanie Ruhle at	16:48:45
20	that time, right?	16:48:47
21	MR. REISNER: Objection to form.	16:48:48
22	MR. WAREHAM: Form objection,	16:48:50
		Page 280

#### Case 1:23-mc-00070-LAK-GWG Document 66-3 Filed 08/23/23 Page 12 of 35 CONFIDENTIAL

1	foundation.	16:48:50
2	A. Well, she's a confidant.	16:48:50
3	Q. What does that mean, confidant?	16:48:52
4	A. She's someone I can get counsel from.	16:48:53
5	Q. Did you have a nondisclosure agreement	16:48:55
6	that you'd executed with Ms. Ruhle?	16:48:58
7	A. No.	16:49:01
8	Q. Handshake deal?	16:49:01
9	A. Yeah. It was an understanding of trust.	16:49:04
10	Q. And was that something you guys had a	16:49:06
11	conversation about?	16:49:07
12	A. No, not in detail I don't believe.	16:49:10
13	Q. So it was just your assumption that you	16:49:12
14	could provide her with nonpublic information about	16:49:13
15	Under Armour's business and she wouldn't mention it	16:49:17
16	to anyone else?	16:49:19
17	MR. REISNER: Objection to form. You may	16:49:20
18	answer.	16:49:21
19	A. Yeah. It was understanding the context is	16:49:21
20	that I would give her counsel on her career and she	16:49:24
21	would give me counsel on things I was dealing with	16:49:26
22	that were either banking or media or human nature	16:49:28
		Page 281

#### Case 1:23-mc-00070-LAK-GWG Document 66-3 Filed 08/23/23 Page 13 of 35 CONFIDENTIAL

1	in relation.	16:49:33
2	Q. Did Ms. Ruhle give you counsel on what we	16:49:38
3	just listened to where you shared with her the fact	16:49:42
4	that Molloy came to you and said we've got to drop	16:49:45
5	the quarter by 10 million?	16:49:48
6	MR. REISNER: Objection to form.	16:49:49
7	A. Yeah. I don't believe so, but I don't	16:49:51
8	recall a conversation following it. As I said, I	16:49:52
9	don't recall making the recording, I don't recall	16:49:57
10	sending the recording out, and I certainly don't	16:49:58
11	recall discussing the recording.	16:50:01
12	(Plank Exhibit 29 was marked	16:50:07
13	for identification.)	16:50:07
14	BY MR. HENSSLER:	16:50:07
15	Q. Let's mark the next exhibit, it's 29.	16:50:07
16	A. I'm going to start meeting you halfway,	16:50:32
17	Tina. It's late in the day.	16:50:34
18	THE REPORTER: Thank you.	16:50:37
19	THE WITNESS: You got it.	16:50:38
20	Q. This is Exhibit 29 to today's deposition.	16:50:39
21	It's also been marked Government Exhibit 213. For	16:50:41
22	the record, Exhibit 29 is Bates UA-IE-10344888.	16:50:44
		Page 282

# Case 1:23-mc-00070-LAK-GWG Document 66-3 Filed 08/23/23 Page 14 of 35 CONFIDENTIAL

		1
1	This is you sending that audio file we just	16:50:53
2	listened to to Stephanie Ruhle, right?	16:50:55
3	A. Yes.	16:51:00
4	Q. And the e-mail address you sent it to is	16:51:00
5	, right?	16:51:03
6	A. Yes.	16:51:08
7	Q. What is that domain, ravenfoundry.com?	16:51:08
8	A. It was an e-mail address.	16:51:13
9	Q. Did you create that e-mail address?	16:51:14
10	A. I didn't personally, but yes, it was part	16:51:16
11	of my a group that I had. I had several phones	16:51:19
12	from there.	16:51:25
13	Q. So you created a separate e-mail address	16:51:26
14	for yourself for a specific phone?	16:51:29
15	A. Yes. I had I had two or three of those	16:51:31
16	phones for a number of different reasons, and I	16:51:35
17	gave them to friends of mine to communicate with.	16:51:37
18	Q. So you gave the phone I'm sorry.	16:51:40
19	A. I said I gave them to friends of mine to	16:51:44
20	communicate with.	16:51:46
21	Q. So you gave Stephanie Ruhle a phone with	16:51:46
22	this e-mail address?	16:51:48
		Page 283

#### Case 1:23-mc-00070-LAK-GWG Document 66-3 Filed 08/23/23 Page 15 of 35 CONFIDENTIAL

1	A. I did.	16:51:49
2	Q. Who created that e-mail address for you?	16:51:51
3	You said it wasn't you.	16:51:54
4	A. Well, whoever the company was.	16:51:55
5	Q. Did one of your assistants handle that for	16:51:57
6	you or you did that yourself?	16:51:59
7	A. I don't recall.	16:52:02
8	Q. Is that something you typically do	16:52:04
9	yourself or did you have Jen Smith do that?	16:52:05
10	A. I probably would have someone from my	16:52:07
11	family office, and Jen Smith worked at Under	16:52:09
12	Armour, not at the family office at that time.	16:52:11
13	Q. And who was Ms. Ruhle at this time?	16:52:23
14	A. I'm sorry?	16:52:27
15	Q. Who was Ms. Ruhle? What was the	16:52:28
16	relationship?	16:52:30
17	A. She's a great friend of mine.	16:52:31
18	Q. And she did not work for Under Armour,	16:52:33
19	though, right?	16:52:35
20	A. No.	16:52:36
21	Q. She never has worked for Under Armour?	16:52:37
22	A. No. Never compensated, never part of it,	16:52:39
		Page 284

#### Case 1:23-mc-00070-LAK-GWG Document 66-3 Filed 08/23/23 Page 16 of 35 CONFIDENTIAL

1	no.		16:52:42
2	Q.	And so she's a great friend and I think	16:52:43
3	you said	a confidant; is that right?	16:52:46
4	Α.	Yeah.	16:52:47
5	Q.	Did she ever fly on the Under Armour jet?	16:52:49
6	A.	Yes, along with 150-plus others.	16:52:52
7	Q.	How many times?	16:52:57
8	A.	Outside people outside of Under	16:52:58
9	Armour.		16:52:59
10	Q.	How many times did Ms. Ruhle fly on the	16:53:00
11	Under Ar	mour jet?	16:53:01
12	Α.	I don't remember. Less than a handful.	16:53:02
13	Q.	Why did she get to fly on the Under Armour	16:53:04
14	jet?		16:53:06
15	Α.	Well, because we were probably going to	16:53:06
16	the same	place in the same city and leaving from	16:53:09
17	the same	destination.	16:53:11
18	Q.	Did you clear that with the Under Armour	16:53:12
19	board of	directors having Ms. Ruhle fly on the	16:53:14
20	Under Ar	mour jet?	16:53:15
21	Α.	Well, it's actually my jet. So I lease it	16:53:16
22	to Under	Armour for Under Armour business and the	16:53:19
			Page 285

#### Case 1:23-mc-00070-LAK-GWG Document 66-3 Filed 08/23/23 Page 17 of 35 CONFIDENTIAL

1	company reimburses me for Under Armour-specific	16:53:20
2	travel. For anything that's outside of that or	16:53:21
3	anybody outside of Under Armour, I would cover that	16:53:25
4	personally or not have that reimbursed.	16:53:28
5	Q. Under Armour pays you a monthly lease	16:53:33
6	payment for that jet; is that right?	16:53:34
7	A. Yes. Well, it depends on the year, but it	16:53:37
8	didn't start until about four or five years into my	16:53:42
9	owning a jet, yes.	16:53:45
10	Q. In this time frame, around 2016, the	16:53:47
11	company leased the jet from you, though, right?	16:53:51
12	A. Portions of the jet, yes.	16:53:54
13	Q. Was it like a regular monthly payment that	16:53:55
14	was made to you from the company for the jet?	16:53:58
15	A. That was one of the aspects as to how we'd	16:54:00
16	get reimbursed, yes.	16:54:03
17	Q. So about 166,000 a month?	16:54:05
18	A. That sounds directionally correct.	16:54:09
19	Q. It was a black Gulfstream; is that	16:54:10
20	correct?	16:54:12
21	A. It is.	16:54:12
22	Q. Did you clear sharing that inside	16:54:14
		Page 286

#### Case 1:23-mc-00070-LAK-GWG Document 66-3 Filed 08/23/23 Page 18 of 35 CONFIDENTIAL

1	information about Under Armour with Ms. Ruhle with	16:54:16
2	the Under Armour board of directors?	16:54:18
3	MR. REISNER: Objection to form, lacks	16:54:20
4	foundation.	16:54:22
5	A. Yeah. I'm not drawing the same conclusion	16:54:24
6	you are.	16:54:26
7	Q. The information that was on the recording	16:54:26
8	of you and Mr. Mirchin talking about Mr. Molloy	16:54:28
9	being a motherfucker for telling you that the	16:54:31
10	company needed to drop the quarter 10 million, did	16:54:33
11	you clear with the board of directors that you were	16:54:36
12	sharing that with somebody outside the company,	16:54:39
13	Stephanie Ruhle?	16:54:41
14	MR. REISNER: Same objection. You may	16:54:42
15	answer.	16:54:43
16	A. I more than likely would have had a	16:54:43
17	conversation with my board of directors to describe	16:54:45
18	the same frustration that I described to Ms. Ruhle	16:54:47
19	regarding Mr. Molloy about asking to take a	16:54:50
20	1.3-billion-dollar quarter down \$10 million in	16:54:53
21	outlook. It was probably a similar frustration.	16:54:58
22	Did I get clearance? I don't believe that that	16:55:00
		Page 287

#### Case 1:23-mc-00070-LAK-GWG Document 66-3 Filed 08/23/23 Page 19 of 35 CONFIDENTIAL

1	would be I don't believe I would think that was	16:55:02
2	something to get clearance on or for for someone	16:55:05
3	that I had in confidence.	16:55:08
4	Q. So you didn't think you needed the board's	16:55:11
5	clearance to share that inside company information	16:55:13
6	with Ms. Ruhle?	16:55:15
7	MR. REISNER: Objection to form, assumes	16:55:16
8	facts not in evidence. You may answer.	16:55:18
9	A. To call my board to ask them if I can	16:55:19
10	speak to Ms. Ruhle in confidence? No, I don't feel	16:55:21
11	I need to do that.	16:55:24
12	Q. Did you share with anyone at the company	16:55:25
13	the fact that you were sharing inside information	16:55:28
14	about Under Armour with Stephanie Ruhle?	16:55:30
15	MR. REISNER: Objection to form, assumes	16:55:33
16	facts not in evidence. You may answer.	16:55:34
17	A. I have a number of different outside	16:55:35
18	advisors who I seek counsel from. I'm very	16:55:38
19	fortunate to have a great black book or Rolodex or	16:55:41
20	a list of names that I can go to to ask counsel for	16:55:43
21	depending on the situation, and when appropriate I	16:55:45
22	would ask different people for their areas of	16:55:47

#### Case 1:23-mc-00070-LAK-GWG Document 66-3 Filed 08/23/23 Page 20 of 35 CONFIDENTIAL

1	and put in one place so it wouldn't be violating a	17:12:52
2	quiet period and make sure the people have the	17:12:55
3	facts of just something that we can say.	17:12:57
4	Q. You wanted this sent to everyone, right,	17:12:59
5	that's why you put it in all caps?	17:13:02
6	MR. REISNER: Objection to form.	17:13:04
7	A. I don't recall.	17:13:04
8	Q. When you put something in all caps like	17:13:05
9	that with an exclamation point, you're adding	17:13:07
10	emphasis, right?	17:13:09
11	A. Perhaps.	17:13:11
12	Q. And Darren, Camile, Robbie, and Omar, are	17:13:14
13	those financial analysts that covered Under Armour	17:13:19
14	at the time?	17:13:21
15	A. Camilo. No. Darren is Darren Rovell,	17:13:23
16	Omar was independent, Robbie may have been between	17:13:31
17	banks. I don't know. Maybe he was still at Bank	17:13:34
18	of America, but he was an analyst at one time for	17:13:37
19	sure.	17:13:39
20	Q. Cramer refers to Jim Cramer from CNBC?	17:13:40
21	A. Yeah.	17:13:43
22	Q. And then did you personally send these	17:13:46
	Pag	e 305

#### Case 1:23-mc-00070-LAK-GWG Document 66-3 Filed 08/23/23 Page 21 of 35 CONFIDENTIAL

1	refute the Morgan Stanley report?	17:18:06
2	MR. WAREHAM: Form, foundation	17:18:08
3	objections.	17:18:09
4	A. I don't recall, but this looks like the	17:18:10
5	basis of facts.	17:18:14
6	(Plank Exhibit 34 was marked	17:18:19
7	for identification.)	17:18:19
8	BY MR. HENSSLER:	17:18:19
9	Q. Let's look at Exhibit 34. For the record,	17:18:19
10	Exhibit 34 is UA_01171520. This is an e-mail you	17:18:40
11	sent as part of your job as the CEO, right?	17:18:48
12	A. I believe, yes.	17:18:50
13	Q. On January 11th, 2016 to Stephanie Ruhle	17:18:51
14	at Bloomberg, correct?	17:18:54
15	A. Well, it looks like I'm just forwarding	17:18:56
16	her some of the response we're getting to	17:18:59
17	getting to the report that came out earlier that	17:19:06
18	day.	17:19:08
19	Q. The Morgan Stanley report?	17:19:08
20	A. Correct.	17:19:09
21	Q. And you wrote in your e-mail at 3:41 on	17:19:09
22	January 11th, 2016 to Ms. Ruhle "These analysts are	17:19:14
		D 212
		Page 310

#### Case 1:23-mc-00070-LAK-GWG Document 66-3 Filed 08/23/23 Page 22 of 35 CONFIDENTIAL

1	all over. Let's get you a list to have them	17:19:19
2	balance that bullshit story poisoning the public	17:19:22
3	markets!" Right?	17:19:26
4	MR. WAREHAM: Objection to form.	17:19:29
5	A. Yeah. Looks like I probably meant to say	17:19:30
6	"these analysts are all over it."	17:19:32
7	Q. As in the analysts are covering the Morgan	17:19:37
8	Stanley report?	17:19:42
9	A. Yeah. Other people read the report as	17:19:42
10	well and they're reacting to it.	17:19:44
11	Q. And you're telling Ms. Ruhle that in your	17:19:46
12	opinion the Morgan Stanley report is poisoning the	17:19:48
13	public markets?	17:19:50
14	A. I can't be sure what I'm talking about	17:19:54
15	there.	17:19:55
16	Q. The bullshit story that you're referring	17:19:56
17	to, is that the Morgan Stanley report?	17:19:58
18	A. Probably.	17:20:00
19	Q. And you sent Ms. Ruhle this analyst report	17:20:03
20	so that she could help you refute the Morgan	17:20:08
21	Stanley report, right?	17:20:10
22	MR. REISNER: Objection, form, asked and	17:20:11
		Page 311

#### Case 1:23-mc-00070-LAK-GWG Document 66-3 Filed 08/23/23 Page 23 of 35 CONFIDENTIAL

1	Q. Well, your phrase "new math," right?	17:26:03
2	A. Sure. I mean, we shared the best ideas.	17:26:05
3	Q. And you sent it to that ravenfoundry.com	17:26:14
4	e-mail that which is the phone that you provided	17:26:18
5	for Ms. Ruhle?	17:26:20
6	A. Yeah.	17:26:21
7	Q. And you wrote to Ms. Ruhle "This is how I	17:26:22
8	feel about our opportunity and I plan to drag my	17:26:24
9	team if I have to forward, and, for the record,	17:26:26
10	having you in my life has helped me write this,"	17:26:29
11	correct?	17:26:32
12	A. Yeah.	17:26:33
13	Q. The "my team" that you're going to drag	17:26:37
14	forward, that refers to your executive team,	17:26:40
15	right?	17:26:41
16	A. I think just the Under Armour team in	17:26:42
17	general.	17:26:43
18	Q. And how did having Ms. Ruhle in your life	17:26:44
19	help you write this e-mail to your executive team?	17:26:47
20	A. I don't recall, but I think she's a	17:26:51
21	positive force that thinks about moving forward.	17:26:57
22	Q. And this e-mail was sent to Ms. Ruhle	17:26:59
		Page 317

#### Case 1:23-mc-00070-LAK-GWG Document 66-3 Filed 08/23/23 Page 24 of 35 CONFIDENTIAL

1	during a quiet period, correct?	17:27:01
2	A. Yeah. It was sent to that confidential	17:27:05
3	e-mail.	17:27:08
4	Q. Two days before the investor call, right?	17:27:08
5	A. Well, as I said, I had her as someone in	17:27:11
6	confidence.	17:27:13
7	Q. There was no agreement that anything was	17:27:14
8	confidential, right?	17:27:15
9	MR. REISNER: Objection to form,	17:27:16
10	misstates	17:27:18
11	A. There was an agreement. There was	17:27:18
12	certainly an understanding that it was not to be	17:27:20
13	shared with anyone of anything we discuss, and the	17:27:21
14	same thing regarding her career.	17:27:25
15	Q. So what was the agreement?	17:27:28
16	A. There's an understanding of	17:27:31
17	confidentiality, to be able to discuss things that	17:27:33
18	wouldn't be shared.	17:27:37
19	You know what? I'm either going to fill	17:27:43
20	that bottle or I need to use the restroom as	17:27:45
21	well.	17:27:48
22	MR. REISNER: Can we go off the record and	17:27:48
		Page 318

## Case 1:23-mc-00070-LAK-GWG Document 66-3 Filed 08/23/23 Page 25 of 35 CONFIDENTIAL

1	take a break. Thank you.	17:27:49
2	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record at	17:27:51
3	17:27.	17:27:53
4	(A break was had.)	17:39:25
5	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're back on the	17:39:31
6	record at 17:39.	17:39:32
7	BY MR. HENSSLER:	17:39:48
8	Q. Welcome back. You understand you're still	17:39:48
9	under oath?	17:39:49
10	A. Yes.	17:39:50
11	Q. And when we took a break you were talking	17:39:50
12	about what you described as the agreement that you	17:39:53
13	had with Stephanie Ruhle. Could you please	17:39:56
14	describe this confidentiality agreement that you	17:40:01
15	had with Ms. Ruhle.	17:40:02
16	A. It's just an understanding that I had with	17:40:04
17	a few expert advisors from different fields that	17:40:06
18	give me counsel, mentors, friends from time to	17:40:09
19	time,	17:40:12
20	Q. I'm specifically asking about the	17:40:15
21	agreement with Ms. Ruhle. Nothing in writing,	17:40:17
22	though, right?	17:40:20
		Page 319

#### Case 1:23-mc-00070-LAK-GWG Document 66-3 Filed 08/23/23 Page 26 of 35 CONFIDENTIAL

1	A. No, but it's a sophisticated banker who	17:40:21
2	understands finance, Wall Street, and as well with	17:40:24
3	media. So there's definitely a depth of	17:40:30
4	understanding that she would know the consequences	17:40:32
5	of breaching any of that confidentiality.	17:40:34
6	Q. What would be the consequences?	17:40:37
7	A. I think it would be very dangerous things	17:40:40
8	to do.	17:40:42
9	Q. What do you mean?	17:40:43
10	A. Inside trading, things like that, trading	17:40:44
11	any of that information, but she wouldn't own the	17:40:47
12	stock, trade in the stock, advise on the stock.	17:40:50
13	Q. We were looking at Exhibit 36. Do you	17:40:58
14	still have that in front of you? It's the	17:41:01
15	July 24th, 2016 e-mail that you sent to Ms. Ruhle.	17:41:06
16	A. Yes. Got it.	17:41:11
17	Q. You didn't clear with anybody that you	17:41:11
18	were sharing this information about Under Armour	17:41:14
19	with Ms. Ruhle, correct?	17:41:17
20	A. No. And no.	17:41:18
21	Q. Okay. We can put that one aside.	17:41:20
22	Let's talk about the 3Q '16 investor call,	17:41:24
		Page 320

#### Case 1:23-mc-00070-LAK-GWG Document 66-3 Filed 08/23/23 Page 27 of 35 CONFIDENTIAL

1	advise," right?	17:42:43
2	A. Yeah.	17:42:45
3	Q. And then in your e-mail to Ms. Ruhle you	17:42:48
4	wrote "Please read the attached script. This was	17:42:52
5	my first stab at the answer to the big question. I	17:42:58
6	have evolved since this version and working the	17:43:02
7	edges of it now," correct?	17:43:05
8	A. Yeah.	17:43:08
9	Q. And the big question that you were	17:43:11
10	answering, does that refer to what you wrote in the	17:43:13
11	next line of your e-mail where it says "What's the	17:43:16
12	new news since investor day September 2015 was	17:43:19
13	800 million and now is 600M-ish??"?	17:43:24
14	A. I don't recall specifically, but that	17:43:32
15	could be it, yes.	17:43:33
16	Q. The "new news" in that line of your	17:43:34
17	e-mail, that does refer to the operating income	17:43:36
18	that was 800 million and now is going to be guided	17:43:38
19	to 600 million-ish, right?	17:43:43
20	MR. REISNER: Objection to form. You may	17:43:45
21	answer.	17:43:49
22	A. Yes.	17:43:50
		Page 322

#### Case 1:23-mc-00070-LAK-GWG Document 66-3 Filed 08/23/23 Page 28 of 35 CONFIDENTIAL

1	Q. You'd agree that the fact that Under	17:43:50
2	Armour was going to drop operating income guidance	17:43:52
3	was material nonpublic information at this time,	17:43:56
4	right?	17:43:58
5	A. Yeah, certainly. This is the eve before	17:43:59
6	our earnings call after the close of the market and	17:44:03
7	looking at seeking counsel on how we could	17:44:06
8	articulate this message to our shareholders and the	17:44:11
9	broader media community.	17:44:13
10	Q. And you understand if somebody had this	17:44:14
11	information, a short sale, for example, they could	17:44:16
12	utilize that information, right?	17:44:18
13	MR. REISNER: Objection to form.	17:44:21
14	MR. WAREHAM: Objection to form,	17:44:21
15	foundation, mischaracterizes the testimony.	17:44:22
16	A. Yeah. If someone traded on that	17:44:24
17	information, sure.	17:44:26
18	Q. Let's look at another part of this e-mail	17:44:36
19	you sent to Ms. Ruhle. The second full paragraph	17:44:38
20	you see there's a star and it says "All those are	17:44:41
21	just"?	17:44:43
22	A. Yes.	17:44:47
		Page 323

#### Case 1:23-mc-00070-LAK-GWG Document 66-3 Filed 08/23/23 Page 29 of 35 CONFIDENTIAL

_		15 40 25
1	going to speak over each other. We just have to	17:48:37
2	make the record. So I apologize. We're not	17:48:37
3	prescient. I can't tell when he's going to speak,	17:48:37
4	and he can't tell when I'm going to speak. So	17:48:37
5	we'll slow it down. You'll get it right.	17:48:37
6	THE REPORTER: I'd appreciate it. It's	17:48:37
7	been a long day.	17:48:37
8	THE WITNESS: Jamie, you give the	17:48:39
9	objection this time.	17:48:40
10	MR. WAREHAM: Form, foundation objections.	17:48:42
11	BY THE WITNESS:	17:48:47
12	A. What was the question again?	17:48:47
13	Q. Happy to restate it.	17:48:48
14	You'd agree, sir, that you did share	17:48:50
15	material nonpublic information about Under Armour's	17:48:53
16	business during the quiet period by sending this	17:48:55
17	e-mail to Ms. Ruhle, which is Exhibit 37?	17:48:58
18	MR. WAREHAM: Form, foundation,	17:49:01
19	competence, calls for multiple legal conclusions.	17:49:02
20	Go ahead and answer.	17:49:05
21	A. I sent this to her the night before the	17:49:06
22	earnings call, yes, which is technically in the	17:49:08

#### Case 1:23-mc-00070-LAK-GWG Document 66-3 Filed 08/23/23 Page 30 of 35 CONFIDENTIAL

_ [		
1	quiet period but doesn't violate anything within my	17:49:10
2	understanding of trust.	17:49:14
3	Q. And you also agree that this was material	17:49:16
4	nonpublic information, the fact that Under Armour	17:49:19
5	was dropping operating income, correct?	17:49:21
6	MR. REISNER: Objection.	17:49:23
7	MR. WAREHAM: Same objections, form,	17:49:24
8	foundation, competence, calls for a legal	17:49:25
9	conclusion.	17:49:28
10	MR. REISNER: And asked and answered.	17:49:29
11	A. Yeah. I don't know how many times I can	17:49:31
12	tell you. I had an understanding of trust with	17:49:32
13	her. She didn't trade in this, her family doesn't	17:49:36
14	trade in this. She's simply giving me input, the	17:49:39
15	same way I talked to sophist this was a yes,	17:49:42
16	this was this was during during the quiet	17:49:48
17	period technically, yes.	17:49:49
18	Q. And it was material nonpublic information?	17:49:51
19	MR. WAREHAM: Same objections, form,	17:49:53
20	foundation, competence, calls for a legal	17:49:54
21	conclusion.	17:49:57
22	A. That was not to be traded on or moved or	17:49:57
		Page 329

#### Case 1:23-mc-00070-LAK-GWG Document 66-3 Filed 08/23/23 Page 31 of 35 CONFIDENTIAL

1	acted on, just simply to give reaction to myself.	17:50:00
2	Q. The answer's yes?	17:50:04
3	MR. WAREHAM: Form, foundation,	17:50:05
4	competence, legal conclusion objections.	17:50:07
5	A. Yeah. Good job.	17:50:09
6	Q. At some point, Mr. Frank, your	17:50:18
7	relationship with Ms. Ruhle was brought to the	17:50:20
8	attention of the Under Armour board of directors,	17:50:23
9	correct?	17:50:25
10	A. My relationship, yes.	17:50:25
11	Q. And do you know who alerted the Under	17:50:27
12	Armour board of directors to your relationship with	17:50:29
13	Ms. Ruhle?	17:50:33
14	A. No.	17:50:33
15	Q. You never heard anything about who that	17:50:36
16	might have been?	17:50:37
17	A. This isn't a topic that I was I'm	17:50:40
18	interested in.	17:50:42
19	Q. Someone at Under Armour uncovered certain	17:50:44
20	e-mails between you and Ms. Ruhle, right?	17:50:47
21	A. I'm not aware.	17:50:49
22	Q. Did the board of directors see the e-mails	17:50:53
		Page 330

#### Case 1:23-mc-00070-LAK-GWG Document 66-3 Filed 08/23/23 Page 32 of 35 CONFIDENTIAL

1	that we have just looked at where you shared	17:50:56
2	information on Under Armour with Ms. Ruhle during	17:50:59
3	various quiet periods?	17:51:01
4	MR. REISNER: Objection to form,	17:51:02
5	foundation, competence.	17:51:03
6	A. Yeah, they did.	17:51:04
7	Q. And then did they question you about the	17:51:06
8	e-mails that we've just looked at where you shared	17:51:07
9	confidential Under Armour information with	17:51:10
10	Ms. Ruhle during various quiet periods?	17:51:13
11	MR. WAREHAM: Form, foundation,	17:51:15
12	competence, legal conclusion, objections.	17:51:17
13	A. I spoke with our lead director, yes.	17:51:17
14	Q. Who's that?	17:51:19
15	A. It was Buzzy Krongard at the time.	17:51:20
16	Q. And did he ask you questions about those	17:51:23
17	e-mails that you sent Ms. Ruhle?	17:51:25
18	A. Yeah.	17:51:27
19	Q. What did he ask you?	17:51:29
20	A. I explained to him the nature of our	17:51:30
21	relationship and the mutual understanding of	17:51:32
22	respect and confidence that we had.	17:51:36
	Pag	e 331

#### Case 1:23-mc-00070-LAK-GWG Document 66-3 Filed 08/23/23 Page 33 of 35 CONFIDENTIAL

1	Q. What else did he ask you?	17:51:41
2	A. I don't recall.	17:51:43
3	Q. Do you recall about when that was?	17:51:46
4	A. I don't recall. Was it '18? '18 or 19?	17:51:52
5	'17, '18, '19. I don't remember.	17:51:59
6	Q. So it was just a one-on-one with the head	17:52:02
7	of the board?	17:52:04
8	A. The conversations I had, yes, in depth was	17:52:05
9	with Buzzy Krongard	17:52:08
10	Q. Did the	17:52:10
11	A our lead director.	17:52:10
12	Q. I'm sorry.	17:52:11
13	Did the Under Armour board of directors	17:52:13
14	take any further actions about what they uncovered	17:52:14
15	about the e-mails to Ms. Ruhle?	17:52:17
16	A. I think they wrote they wrote a note	17:52:19
17	for a file for me I believe is what happened.	17:52:21
18	Q. Did they ask you to stop doing that?	17:52:25
19	A. Yeah. They asked to that they wouldn't	17:52:29
20	look fondly on sharing that information. I	17:52:32
21	explained the mutual understanding, and they	17:52:35
22	understood it and just said, yep, as a result of	17:52:38
		Page 332

#### Case 1:23-mc-00070-LAK-GWG Document 66-3 Filed 08/23/23 Page 34 of 35 CONFIDENTIAL

1	that we're advising you not to do that. I said	17:52:41
2	thanks very much, that's really helpful, but we	17:52:46
3	didn't feel any obligation we checked with	17:52:49
4	counsel. We didn't feel any obligation to	17:52:51
5	disclose, to notify anyone, and there was no breach	
6	or any evidence of anybody doing anything outside	17:52:56
7	of other than just exchanging information with one	
8	another from time to time.	17:53:01
9	Q. So the board instructed you to stop that	17:53:02
10	practice?	17:53:06
11	A. What practice?	17:53:07
12	Q. Sharing company inside information with	17:53:08
13	Stephanie Ruhle.	17:53:10
14	MR. REISNER: Objection to form.	17:53:11
15	A. No. They simply just asked there	17:53:12
16	wasn't anything to go to that level of detail, but	17:53:15
17	yeah, they asked please don't e-mail, don't share	17:53:17
18	back. You'll have your advisors, talk to who you	17:53:20
19	need to talk to. That was it.	17:53:25
20	Q. Did they say it's okay to continue sharing	17:53:27
21	nonpublic information about the company with	17:53:29
22	Stephanie Ruhle?	17:53:32

#### Case 1:23-mc-00070-LAK-GWG Document 66-3 Filed 08/23/23 Page 35 of 35 CONFIDENTIAL

1	A. I don't think that was the view. I think	17:53:33
2	the ask was yeah, the sending the e-mail over	17:53:37
3	the script was one that I didn't have a	17:53:41
4	recollection of that either and that's one that was	17:53:46
5	pretty arresting to me, but yeah, because I could	17:53:50
6	see how that would be perceived and it would make	17:53:53
7	people uncomfortable and it would really press	17:53:56
8	the you know, the confidence from Ms. Ruhle too.	17:53:58
9	So I don't think that put her in a very fair	17:54:01
10	position and I don't think it was the right thing	17:54:03
11	for our board or myself. And so I acknowledged. I	17:54:05
12	agreed with, you know, Mr. Krongard and said I	17:54:07
13	wouldn't do that again.	17:54:09
14	Q. And did you then after that conversation	17:54:12
15	with Mr. Krongard stop sharing inside company	17:54:15
16	information with Ms. Ruhle?	17:54:20
17	MR. REISNER: Objection to form, assumes	17:54:21
18	facts not in evidence. You may answer.	17:54:23
19	A. I mean, we continued to talk, I continued	17:54:25
20	to use Ms. Ruhle as an advisor I mean, as	17:54:27
21	someone that I would share information with.	17:54:30
22	Q. So you disregarded Mr. Krongard's	17:54:33